

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
EASTERN DIVISION**

Jonathan Lazuka,)	CASE NO. 1:24 CV 1873
)	
Plaintiff,)	JUDGE PATRICIA A. GAUGHAN
)	
vs.)	
)	
Commissioner of Social Security,)	
)	<u>Memorandum of Opinion and Order</u>
)	
Defendant.)	

INTRODUCTION

This matter is before the Court on the Report and Recommendation (“R&R”) of Magistrate Judge Reuben J. Sheperd (Doc. 10), recommending that the Court vacate the Commissioner’s final decision denying plaintiff’s application for disability insurance benefits and that this case be remanded for further consideration of Dr. Smith’s opinion. No objections have been filed. For the reasons that follow, the R&R is ACCEPTED, and the decision of the Commissioner is VACATED and REMANDED.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

When objections are made to a Magistrate Judge’s Report and Recommendation, the district court reviews the case *de novo*. Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72(b)(3) provides that: “The district judge must determine de novo any part of the magistrate judge’s disposition that has been properly

objected to.” As stated in the Advisory Committee Notes, “When no timely objection is filed, the court need only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.” In *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 150 (1985), the Court held that “[i]t does not appear that Congress intended to require district court review of a magistrate judge’s factual or legal conclusions, under a *de novo* or any other standard, when neither party objects to those findings.”

DECISION

This Court, having reviewed the R&R and finding no clear error, hereby ACCEPTS the Magistrate Judge’s R&R. In accordance with that recommendation, the decision of the Commissioner is VACATED and REMANDED for further consideration of Dr. Smith’s opinion.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

/s/ Patricia A. Gaughan

PATRICIA A. GAUGHAN
United States District Judge

Dated: 7/7/25